REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

This amendment changes and/or deletes claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claim(s) remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

Claims 1, 3 and 14 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Claims 2, 4, 5 and 8-12 have been amended. Claims 2, 4 and 15 have all been amended to be in independent form. Claims 2, 4, 5 and 8-12 have been amended to improve their readability without narrowing their scope. No new matter has been added.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 2, 4-13 and 15-20 are now pending in this application.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,343,350 to LaMaire et al. (hereafter "LaMaire"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections, insofar at they pertain to the claims as amended, for at least the following reasons.

Claims 2, 4 and 15 have all been amended to be in independent form. Independent claims 2 and 4 both recite "an information reduction portion which reduces an amount of the information accumulated in said cache memory based on attribute information composed of preference information of a user and profile information indicative of a process ability of said client apparatus when said storage judgment portion judges that the information externally provided can not be stored in said cache memory." Claim 15 is directed to a method and analogously recites "reducing the amount of the information accumulated in said cache memory based on attribute information composed of preference information of a user and profile information indicative of a process ability of said client apparatus when said judging step (6) judges that the information provided by said information source server can not be

stored in said cache memory". Lamaire fails to disclose at least these features as claimed.

LaMaire discloses a system including a client computer 100 connected to a second computer, proxy 160, which in turn communicates to a third computer, web server 170 (col. 3, lines 47-49). Caches may be present in the client and proxy, and in some cases the server (col. 3, lines 55-57). LaMaire discloses a particular method for removing an object from a network object cache in order to create space to store a new network object not currently in cache (Fig. 5, col. 6, lines 6-9). Specifically, LaMaire discloses that the least-recently-used object is found and the space for this object is freed (col. 6, lines 21-24).

While LaMaire discloses freeing memory space by removing a least-recently-used object to create space for a new object, in contrast to claims 2, 4 and 15, LaMaire does not disclose reducing an amount of the information accumulated in a cache memory based on attribute information composed of preference information of a user and profile information indicative of a process ability of the client apparatus. The information about the least-recently-used object is not attribute information composed of both: (1) preference information of a user, and (2) profile information indicative of a process ability of the client apparatus (client compute 100). Thus, LaMaire fails to anticipate independent claims 2, 4 and 15.

The dependent claims ultimately depend from one of claims 4 and 15, and are patentable for at least the same reasons, as well as for further patentable features recited therein.

For example, with respect to claim 5, LaMaire does not disclose "a transfer portion which transfers the information accumulated in said second cache memory to said client apparatus through said first data communication network based on said attribute information and said communication attribute information", where the attribute information is composed of preference information of a user and profile information indicative of a process ability of the client apparatus. Method claim 16 corresponds to claim 5 and is further patentable for reasons analogous to claim 5.

With respect to claims 6 and 7, LaMaire does not disclose "wherein said information source server provides the information to said gateway apparatus based on said attribute

information and said communication attribute information in response to the request from said second request portion" and "wherein said gateway apparatus provides the information to said client apparatus based on said attribute information and said communication attribute information in response to the request from said request portion", respectively, where the attribute information is composed of preference information of a user and profile information indicative of a process ability of the client apparatus. Method claims 17 and 18 correspond to claims 6 and 7, respectively, and are further patentable for reasons analogous to claims 6 and 7 respectively.

With respect to claim 8, LaMaire does not disclose "an attribute information change portion in which at least one of said attribute information and said communication attribute information is dynamically changed."

With respect to claims 9 and 10, LaMaire does not disclose "wherein said information reduction portion removes the information having a low priority from said cache memory, wherein the priority is determined based on said attribute information" and "wherein said information reduction portion compresses the information stored in said cache memory based on said attribute information", respectively, where the attribute information is composed of preference information of a user and profile information indicative of a process ability of the client apparatus. Method claims 19 and 20 correspond to claims 9 and 10, respectively, and are further patentable for reasons analogous to claims 9 and 10, respectively.

With respect to claim 11, LaMaire does not disclose "wherein the information provided by said information source server includes menu data for selecting an item and is linked to other information corresponding to other menu data, the other information being provided by said information source server based on the selected item, and said control portion controls said cache memory such that a remaining capacity of said cache memory is increased by changing the link generated between the menu data and the other menu data, every time one of the menu data and the other menu data is stored in said cache memory." The section cited in the Office Action as disclosing this feature fails to disclose the menu data, the other information, or any such linking as recited in claim 11.

Applicant believes that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date September 14, 2004

By Thomas G. Bilodeau

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5407
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399

Thomas G. Bilodeau
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 43,438